

REMARKS

Claims 50-69 are pending in the application. Claims 50-69 stand rejected. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims.

Rejection Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 50-52, 54-57, 60-63, 65, 68, and 69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,915,008 (Dulman). Applicant respectfully contends that Dulman does not anticipate the claims for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 50 recites a service control point (SCP) configured to determine redirection capabilities for a first destination based upon a dialed number received into the SCP in a first query for a call. The SCP then generates a query response containing call handling information for the call *and the redirection capabilities for the first destination*. Claim 50 advantageously provides for defining call redirection capabilities for a toll-free number that terminates to a destination or a trunk group *independent of the redirection capabilities of other toll-free numbers that terminate on the same trunk group*. For example, redirection capabilities for a first destination could include confirmed, unconfirmed, or consultative redirection. Please see Applicant's Specification, page 9, line 24 to page 12, line 9 for support.

In contrast, Dulman does not disclose an SCP that determines redirection capabilities for a destination for a call. Rather, Dulman discloses a provisioning system that enables subscribers to activate services in elements of an advanced intelligent network (AIN), such as an SCP (Dulman, col. 6, lines 9-15). Dulman does not disclose an SCP that operates in the manner required by claim 50.

The Office Action includes a citation to Dulman, col. 8, line 46, to col. 9, line 13, as being of particular relevance to claims 50-52. This portion of Dulman discloses call redirection services based on data stored in an SCP. However, this portion of Dulman does not disclose an SCP that provides call handling information *and the redirection capabilities for a first destination as required by claim 50*.

Independent claim 61 contains limitations similar to those of independent claim 50 and is therefore allowable over the art of record. The dependent claims, while

separately allowable over the art of record, depend from allowable independent claims. Applicant therefore refrains from a discussion of the dependent claims for the sake of brevity. Applicant also refrains from a discussion of the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the discussion distinguishing Dulman from the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore solicits their allowance.



Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176
Duft Setter Ollila & Bornsen
Tel: (303) 938-9999 ext. 15
Fax: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Harley R. Ball
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100